

REMARKS

This communication is responsive to the Office Action mailed June 16, 2005.

Claims 2-23 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Oosterhout et al. (US 6,405,371) in view of Yoshida et al. (US 6,137,486).

Oosterhout discloses navigation through television programs involving the steps of displaying television programs as a mosaic of sub-images on a display screen, receiving an electronic program guide with program descriptions, receiving a user command activating a “theme” button so the viewer can enter a desired program type such as the type “movie”, and reducing the brightness of the sub-images on the display for the undesired programs (abstract; col. 1, lines 36-44).

However, as noted by the Examiner, Oosterhout does not disclose, suggest, or teach providing data for a predetermined user. Further, Oosterhout does not have anything whatsoever to do with providing a user description scheme or any method or mechanism containing user preference data. Instead, Oosterhout relies exclusively on direct user interaction to navigate to the desired television programs and, therefore, has no motivation for the use of a user description scheme or other description schemes.

Yoshida discloses an image display control device for preventing viewing of video scenes regarded as educationally inappropriate (col. 2, lines 1-4). The broadcast receiver can set a second restriction level different from a first restriction level that is included in the video signal broadcast by the transmitter. The receiver can then control the displayed video on the television by comparing the second restriction to the first and therefrom determine which scenes to block and which to pass through (col. 2, lines 24-37). A “Program Lock” feature is provided for setting the second restriction level and a password to prevent (a child from) resetting the restriction level to a more lenient setting or turning the device off (col. 9, lines 6-31).

However, Yoshida does not disclose, suggest, or teach providing a user description scheme containing user preference data for a predetermined user and at least one descriptor for identification of said predetermined user as claimed in currently amended claim 21.

Appl. No. 09/804,612
Amdt. dated November 16, 2005
Reply to Office Action of June 16, 2005

Claims 2-20 and 22-24 depend either directly or indirectly from independent claim 21 and are, therefore, patentable over the cited art for at least the same reasons asserted for independent claim 21.

The Applicants respectfully submit that all the pending claims should now be in a form suitable for allowance, and allowance of such claims is requested. If the Examiner for any reason believes that direct communication would advance the prosecution of this case, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicants' counsel at the number below.

Respectfully submitted,

CHERNOFF, VILHAUER, MCCLUNG & STENZEL, LLP



J. Douglas Wells
Reg. No. 50,477
Tel No.: (503) 227-5631

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service as first class mail postage prepaid in an envelope addressed to: MAIL STOP Amendment, Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450 on the date indicated below.

Dated: November 16, 2005



J. Douglas, Wells, Reg. No. 50,477